IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ex rel. W.A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his capacity as ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA and OKLAHOMA SECRETARY OF THE ENVIRONMENT C. MILES TROBERT, his capacity as the TRUSTEE FOR NATURAL RESOURCES FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,

) Case No.) 05-CV-329-TCK-SAJ

Plaintiff(s),

-vs-

TYSON FOODS, INC.; TYSON POULTRY, INC.; TYSON CHICKEN, INC.; COBB-VANTRESS, INC.; AVIAGEN, INC., CAL-MAINE FOODS, INC.; CAL-MAINE FARMS, INC.; CARGILL, INC.; CARGILL TURKEY PRODUCTION, LLC; GEORGE'S, INC.; GEORGE'S FARMS, INC.; PETERSON FARMS, INC.; SIMMONS FOODS, INC.; and WILLOW BROOK FOODS, INC.,

Defendant(s).

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS,

held before the Honorable Sam A. Joyner, Magistrate Judge in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma on February 15, 2007.

APPEARANCES

For the Plaintiff State of Oklahoma:

Mr. Frederick C. Baker Mr. Louis W. Bullock Ms. Kelly S. Hunter Burch

Mr. David P. Page

Mr. Melvin D. Riggs

Mr. Richard T. Garren and

Mr. James R. Miller Attorneys at Law

(Appearances continued . . .)

EUSTICE REPORTING SERVICE

CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER POST OFFICE BOX 700488 TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74170 (918) 445-2965



1.3

plenty of time to maybe spend a little bit talking about scheduling. Let's take our afternoon break. Try to be back at 10 minutes after three.

(Whereupon, a short recess was held after which the following record was made.)

THE COURT: I know we turned up the heat.

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, it hadn't reached me yet.

I don't know whether it makes any difference. I don't anticipate ruling from the bench on any of the issues that we've set down for today. I think on issues of this significance that the first word should be in writing. So that's the other issue. And all right. I guess you can proceed, Mr. George. One concern I have is the confusion about the boxes and the fact that we may not be Bates-stamping and that there's no apparent coordination in regard to preservation of important evidence.

MR. GEORGE: Your Honor, I certainly don't believe that's the case. I believe that the documents that are in this box are in fact Bates-numbered. So I'm frankly a little mystified as to the argument by Mr. Bullock. I'm frankly not aware of any confusion regarding the Bates-numbered documents. In fact, these documents that are in the box that I have are

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Bates-numbered by agency, ODEQ. Box number, I think there's a reference number there and page number like 632. So in any event, I certainly -- I don't share the anxiety that apparently Mr. Bullock has regarding the integrity of the boxes.

I would say this, as perhaps it's as good a starting point as any, Your Honor, that there seems to be a bit of paranoia on the part of Mr. Bullock as to whether my OWRB box one was the same as his OWRB box one. Your Honor, there certainly were some instances, as I understand it, in such the defendants copied part of a box but not all of the box. One of things that I strived to do in putting together my argument for today was to identify boxes that we can confirm, and we absolutely can confirm, where complete copies of boxes from the relevant agencies. So for example, both OWRB box -- water quality box one, we have documentation where we notified the vendor we wanted a complete copy that have box and the same with respect to ODEQ land protection box two. this notion, Your Honor, that somehow Robert George has evilly altered the contents of a box and therefore that's the explanation for why he can't find the answer that apparently is so self-evident to the plaintiffs in the case, is just simply imagined, Your Honor.

A good part of Mr. Bullock's argument -- in